

***No Child Left Behind Act of 2001***  
**Public Law 107-110**

**ESEA Title II, Part B**

---

**Montana**

***Mathematics and Science  
Partnerships (MSP) Program***

**2015 Competitive \$20,000 Mini Grant  
Application**

**Due Date: November 30, 2014**



**opi.mt.gov**

**Denise Juneau, Superintendent  
Montana Office of Public Instruction  
PO Box 202501  
Helena, MT 59620-2501  
[www.opi.mt.gov](http://www.opi.mt.gov)**

## Table of Contents

I. Purpose of Montana MSP Mini Grant .....	3
II. Goal of Montana MSP Mini Grant .....	3
III. OPI MSP Mini Grant Application Technical Assistance .....	4
IV. General MSP Mini Grant General Information.....	4
Eligibility .....	4
Mini Grant Award: Number & Amount .....	4
Duration of Grant.....	4
Funds Available .....	5
Use of Funds .....	5
V. Program Requirements .....	5
Required Partners.....	5
Required External Evaluator.....	5
Required Core Planning Team.....	5
Private School Participation .....	6
Reporting Requirements .....	6
VI. Application Process .....	7
Subsequent Opportunity to Apply .....	7
Instructions for Submission .....	8
VII. Requirements and Preparation of Application .....	8
Cover Page.....	8
Abstract.....	8
Partnership Operational Narrative .....	8
Partnership Evaluation and Accountability Plan .....	9
Partnership Budget and Budget Narrative .....	9
Proposal Appendices .....	9
Review Process .....	10
FFATA Reporting Requirements .....	10
General Guidelines .....	11
Scoring.....	11
Appendix A – Cover Sheet .....	12
Appendix B – Statement of Assurances .....	13
Appendix C – Research and Policy Base .....	14
Appendix D – Partnership Identification Form .....	16
Appendix E – Budget Form.....	17
Appendix F – Levels of PD Evaluation – Guskey Model .....	18
Appendix G – MSP Mini Grant Application Review Rubric.....	19
Appendix H – Resource Links.....	22

## **I. PURPOSE**

In January 2002, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) became law. ESEA Title II, Part B of this legislation authorizes the Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) competitive grant program. The purpose of this program is to improve the academic achievement of students in the areas of mathematics and science by encouraging state education agencies, institutions of postsecondary education, local education agencies, elementary schools, and secondary schools to participate in programs that improve instruction and upgrade the status and stature of mathematics and science teaching.

The MSP program is a formula grant program to the states, with the size of individual state awards based on student population and poverty rates. With these funds, each State is responsible for administering a competitive grant competition, in which grants are made to partnerships to improve teacher knowledge in mathematics and science. The Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) is responsible for the administration of this program. ESEA Title I and ESEA Title II, Part A funds may be used to support the partnership's activities to demonstrate progress toward meeting the district partner's Title I Adequate Yearly Progress goals.

The Montana OPI is responsible for conducting this competitive grant program and will make awards to partnerships of high-need school districts and science, mathematics, and engineering departments within postsecondary education institutions. The overall goal is to give districts, and mathematics and science postsecondary education faculty, joint responsibility for improving mathematics and science instruction through the process of implementing high-quality professional learning.

The overall purpose of the ESEA Title II, Part B MSP program is to improve the academic achievement of students in the areas of mathematics and science by encouraging State educational agencies, postsecondary education institutions, local educational agencies (LEA), elementary schools and secondary schools to participate in programs that:

- improve and upgrade the status and stature of mathematics and science teaching by encouraging postsecondary education institutions to improve mathematics and science teacher education;
- focus on the education of mathematics and science teachers as a career-long process;
- bring mathematics and science teachers together with scientists, mathematicians, and engineers to improve their teaching skills;
- develop more rigorous mathematics and science curricula that are aligned with challenging state and local academic content standards and with the standards expected for postsecondary study in engineering, mathematics, and science; and
- improve and expand professional learning of mathematics and science teachers, including teaching such educators in the effective integration of technology into curricula and instruction.

## **II. GOAL OF MINI GRANT**

The OPI will award this portion of the 2013-2015 ESEA Title II, Part B MSP funding to one partnership. The project will improve K-12 math student learning and math teaching skills by producing high-quality professional learning. The partnership will accomplish the following goal: The current 2013-2015 grant, Standards-based Teaching Renewing Educators Across Montana (STREAM), provides services to grades 4-7. The partnership awarded this grant will work with STREAM to create a module which will extend the grades serviced to include 8<sup>th</sup> grade.

### III. MONTANA OPI MSP GRANT APPLICATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

For information and technical assistance, contact any of the following:

**Jael Prezeau, Content Standards and Instruction Director**  
**Office of Public Instruction**  
**Telephone: (406) 444-3128**  
**E-mail: [jprezeau@mt.gov](mailto:jprezeau@mt.gov)**

**Jake Warner, Mathematics Instructional Coordinator**  
**Office of Public Instruction**  
**Telephone: (406) 444-0706**  
**E-mail: [jwarner@mt.gov](mailto:jwarner@mt.gov)**

**Chris Dewald, Science Instructional Coordinator**  
**Office of Public Instruction**  
**Telephone: (406) 444-3557**  
**E-mail: [cdewald@mt.gov](mailto:cdewald@mt.gov)**

**Tara Steinke, Administrative and Data Assistant**  
**Office of Public Instruction**  
**Telephone: (406) 444-3538**  
**E-Mail: [tsteinke@mt.gov](mailto:tsteinke@mt.gov)**

### IV. GENERAL GRANT INFORMATION

#### ELIGIBILITY

Partnerships of local education agencies (LEAs) and postsecondary education institutions may apply for the MSP Mini Grant.

The term “high-need school district” means a school district that: (1) serves no fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line or a school district for which 20 percent of the children are from families with incomes below the poverty line; **or** (2) has a high percentage of teachers not teaching in the academic subjects or grade levels that the teachers were trained to teach; **or** has a high percentage of teachers with Emergency Authorization of Employment or Alternative License when compared to other districts in the state.

#### GRANT AWARD: NUMBER AND AMOUNT

The OPI will award one grant. **The grant proposal will clearly describe how this project will collaborate and coordinate with the existing STREAM grant.**

The grant may be funded for up to \$20,000 for the year and must be spent by August 1, 2015.

#### DURATION OF GRANT

The selected grantee will begin work immediately after the selection process is complete. The grant will run until August 1, 2015.

## USE OF FUNDS

Funds received shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, funds that would otherwise be used for proposed activities. Follow EDGAR requirements.

Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR):  
EDGAR sections 74, 76, 77, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86, 98, 99 apply to this program  
[www.ed.gov/policy/fund/reg/edgarReg/edgar.pdf](http://www.ed.gov/policy/fund/reg/edgarReg/edgar.pdf)

## V. PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

### REQUIRED PARTNERS

To be eligible, a partnership **must** at a minimum, include each of the following:

1. a high-need local educational agency (LEA), as defined in **Section IV. General Grant Information, Eligibility**;
2. an engineering, technology, mathematics, or science department of a postsecondary education institution, which may be a department in a 4-year university, 2-year technical college, tribal college, or community college; and

A partnership **may** include:

- a teacher education department of a postsecondary institution;
- another technology, engineering, mathematics or teacher education department of a postsecondary institution;
- additional LEAs, public or private elementary or secondary schools, or a consortium of such schools;
- a business; or
- a nonprofit or for-profit organization of demonstrated effectiveness in improving the quality of mathematics teachers.

### REQUIRED EXTERNAL EVALUATOR

A qualified external project evaluator **must** be used by mini grant recipient to design, implement, and manage an evaluation and accountability system that includes rigorous objectives used to measure the formative and summative impact of the project. The external project evaluator will work in collaboration with the MSP partnership to determine the common expected outcomes and measurement indicators for the project and in accordance with federal and state guidelines.

### REQUIRED CORE PLANNING TEAM

The mini grant project **must** have a core planning team in place to oversee the general design and implementation of the project. At a minimum, the team will consist of the following:

1. a teacher from one or more of the partner LEAs;
2. a building principal or district superintendent from one of the partner LEAs;
3. a participating STEM faculty member;
4. a math education faculty member;
5. a representative of STREAM chosen by STREAM; and
6. the project evaluator.

**PRIVATE SCHOOL PARTICIPATION**

Funds awarded through this mini grant are subject to the requirements of Section 14503 of ESEA Pub.L. 108-382 (Participation by Private School Children and Teachers) and the regulations in 34 CFR 299, Subpart E. The statute and regulations require that the grant partnership provide private schools in their area, the opportunity for meaningful collaboration with the partnership during the planning process for any subsequent professional development activities. Further, the grant partnership must provide private school children and their teachers, or other educational personnel, the opportunity to receive services and benefits of the program on an equitable basis with public school students and teachers.

**REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

The U.S. Department of Education and the Montana OPI require the following:

1. The grant partnership's completion of the online Annual Performance Report (APR), <http://apr.ed-msp.net/users/login>, providing project information and reporting the partnership's progress in meeting the objectives described in the evaluation and accountability plan. These objectives must include measures of student and teacher content knowledge and skills in mathematics and/or science.
2. The Montana OPI Math Science Partnership Program State Coordinators to monitor all projects on an ongoing basis to ensure compliance with all requirements.

## VI. APPLICATION PROCESS

### APPLICATION TIMELINE: MSP COMPETITIVE MINI GRANT

2014-2015 Application Timeline	
<b>November 10</b>	Request for Proposal (RFP) posted on Montana OPI Web site and announced via OPI official e-mail
<b>November 30</b>	Applications received electronically by the OPI by 5:00 p.m. <i>No facsimile grant applications will be accepted.</i>
<b>December 1-14</b>	Application review process
<b>December 15</b>	Grant award announced
<b>December 15-31</b>	Comments provided to non-funded grant applications
<b>December 16</b>	Project funds become available
<b>August 1</b>	Deadline for expenditure of grant funds
<b>September 15</b>	Fiscal closeout
<b>September 30</b>	Grant ends

#### SUBSEQUENT OPPORTUNITY TO APPLY

The OPI is committed to the competitive process required by this program. The mini grant award will be made only for a high-quality proposal that describes a program that attends to all competition requirements. There is no obligation on the part of the Montana OPI to award all the available funds in this round of competition.

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMISSION

Mail the completed original Montana MSP Mini Grant application and two copies to: Office of Public Instruction, ATTN: Tara Steinke, OPI-CSI, PO Box 202501, Helena, MT 59620-2501, postmarked no later than November 30, 2014;

## AND

By 5:00 p.m. November 30, 2014, submit an electronic PDF copy of the completed grant application to:

**Tara Steinke, OPI-CSI**  
**Office of Public Instruction**  
**E-Mail: [tsteinke@mt.gov](mailto:tsteinke@mt.gov)**

*Faxed applications will not be accepted.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## VII. REQUIREMENTS AND PREPARATION OF APPLICATION

**COVER PAGE** – Use the form provided in Appendix A of the RFP. The cover page is the first page of the application.

**ABSTRACT** – Provide an abstract of the proposal that briefly and concisely describes the program to be implemented and summarizes the intended results of the program. Projects need to keep this abstract between 200 to 300 words.

**PARTNERSHIP OPERATIONAL NARRATIVE** – The partnership narrative must address each of the following items. Applications must keep the narrative to no more than 25 pages, use half inch or larger margins, use Times New Roman, 12 point, be double spaced and include no more than 30 lines of type per page.

- a. Partnerships – The partnership narrative will summarize the makeup of the partnership and how the partnership operates.
- b. Project Plan –The narrative will include time frame, resources, responsible persons and evaluation components.
- c. Alignment with Montana Common Core Standards for Mathematics– The partnership narrative will clearly explain the tie between professional development and the common standards for mathematics.
- d. Coordination with STREAM – The partnership narrative will clearly explain how the project is coordinating with the STREAM team to ensure the new module will cohere with existing STREAM modules.
- e. Management/Capability – The partnership narrative will clearly demonstrate that the partnership has the capability of managing the program, organizing the work and meeting deadlines.



**PARTNERSHIP EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN** – The partnership narrative **must** address each of the following items. Applications **must** keep the evaluation and accountability plan narrative to no more than eight pages, use half inch or larger margins, use Times New Roman, 12 point, be double spaced and include no more than 30 lines of type per page.

The partnership plan will:

- a. describe how the effectiveness of the partnership itself will be assessed;
- b. describe how it will evaluate the overall success of the project (summative). The partnership plan will explain how it will determine whether the partnership activities have increased administrator and K-12 teacher knowledge and skills in mathematics;
- c. describe how it will measure progress toward meeting its objectives (formative). Mid-term and annual reports on progress related to this outcome will be reviewed by the project evaluator and provided to the OPI on an annual basis;
- d. reference the professional development evaluation model developed by Thomas Guskey, attached at **Appendix F**, as a guideline for evaluating the professional development project. **Evaluation of levels one through five will be reflected in the overall evaluation plan, with particular emphasis given to level five, the impact of professional development on student learning outcomes.** The narrative will clearly and concisely describe the process and instruments to be used for each component, and if, and how, the instrument's validity and reliability will be determined; and
- e. describe how the results of various formative and summative evaluations will be disseminated to the partnership, and to other possible venues, including method and time line for dissemination.

#### **PARTNERSHIP BUDGET AND BUDGET NARRATIVE**

The budget narrative will be clearly tied to the plan summarized in the Partnership Operational Narrative. The budget narrative will describe the basis for determining the amounts shown on the overall project budget page and for each of the partner funding request pages submitted (Appendix D).

#### **PROPOSAL APPENDICES**

The grant application appendices should include only the following documents. These appendices are not included in the application page limit.

- a. Cover Page
- b. Statement of Assurances (**prime applicants other than school districts must contact the Montana OPI for proper common assurance forms required for submission with the proposal**)
- c. Partnership Identification Forms
- d. Budget Forms
- e. Letter of Commitment from each partner
- f. Partner Funding Request for each partner

## REVIEW PROCESS

The application review process includes: (1) proposals scored through an external review by a panel experienced in reading similar grant applications; (2) recommendations made to the Montana OPI team by the external review panel; and (3) final decisions made by the Montana OPI review team based on the external panel recommendations and required policy decisions regarding the award.

**The successful grant applicant will be notified by December 15, 2014, of grant awards. Decisions of the Montana OPI on funding and awarding of grant shall be final.**

***Application Scoring:*** *Appendix G* provides the basic rubric used in the review process. Along with the numerical score, each reviewer will list the strengths and weaknesses of the responses to each part. A proposal accepted for funding may require project and budget revisions before final approval and funding is released.

## FFATA REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) was signed on September 26, 2006. The intent is to empower every American with the ability to hold the government accountable for each spending decision. The end result is to reduce wasteful spending in the government. As of October 1, 2010, new reporting requirements were issued requiring recipients of federal grants and contracts to comply with sub recipient reporting requirements under the FFATA (Pub. L. 109-282). Awardees (in this case the state) receiving new awards of \$25,000 or more will report on newly issued sub grants (your program). The information reported will be made available to the public at USASpending.gov. The following data must be reported by the prime awardee (the state) under FFATA:

- name of the entity receiving the award;
- amount of the award;
- information on the award including transaction type, funding agency, program source, award title and Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number;
- location of the entity receiving the award and primary location of the performance under the award, including city, state, congressional district and country;
- DUNS number of the entity receiving the award or the parent entity of the recipient; *and, when applicable (This will not apply to most MSP sub grantees)*
- names and total compensation of the five highest compensated officers of the entity if, during the preceding fiscal year, it received: (a) 80 percent or more of its annual gross revenues in federal awards, and (b) \$25 million or more in annual gross revenues from federal awards; or if the public does not have access to information about the compensation of the executive through periodic reports filed under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 or section 6104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

The state will report sub award information using the FFATA Sub Award Reporting System (<http://www.fsrs.gov>). The state must report information related to the sub award by the end of the month following the month that the sub award or obligation was made (e.g., if the prime awardee made the sub award between March 1 and March 31, 2011, it must submit sub award information by April 30, 2011).

When applicable, the prime awardee must submit its own executive compensation data, as well as the executive compensation data of its sub awardees, in the same manner.

In order to better assist the Montana OPI with this requirement, it is *encouraged* that all sub grantees register with the Central Contractor Registration System (CCR). Those sub grantees who register with the CCR (<http://ccr.gov>) will have their information pre-populated into the FFATA Sub Award Reporting System (FSRS), reducing the burden for collecting and disseminating the required data within the timeline outlined above. The Montana OPI appreciates your support in this matter.

## GENERAL GUIDELINES

As proposals are received at the Montana OPI, they will be reviewed by staff for completeness and compliance with the requirements set forth in ESEA Title II, Part B of NCLB to determine applicant eligibility. Any questions about significant omissions from a proposal or about applicant eligibility will be referred to the proposing organization. If, in the judgment of the Montana OPI, a proposal is late, significantly incomplete, or an applicant cannot establish its eligibility, the proposal will be omitted from consideration. The decision of the Montana OPI is final. Applicants submitting proposals that are withdrawn due to incompleteness or ineligibility will be notified in writing.

A review panel will evaluate eligible applications on the basis of the required application components and the established criteria. The review panel will assess each eligible application and make recommendations to the Montana OPI in the areas of program, budget, and efficacy. The review panel's scores and recommendations will be the primary determinant of successful proposals and will form the basis for negotiation and final selection. Following the review, the Montana OPI staff will contact eligible project directors to discuss any modifications of the project plan that may be required. The Montana OPI will seek to fund those proposals that show the most promise for successful professional development programs.

## SCORING

The panel of reviewers will assess each plan. Each aspect or part of the plan will be worth a set number of points (see chart below). Individual panel members will evaluate each aspect and assign points up to the maximum for each aspect. They will be asked to list strengths and weaknesses for each aspect as well. Finally, the Montana OPI review team will review the scored applications, add in bonus points earned, total the scores, and then make necessary policy decisions regarding the successful awards to grantees.

Proposal Aspect	Maximum Points
Overall Design and Efficacy of Project	25
Makeup, Commitment and Capacity of Partnership	15
Quality/Level of Implementation and Sustainability Support for the Participants	20
Quality of Evaluation and Accountability Plan	25
Budget and Cost Effectiveness	15
Total Possible Points	100

**Appendix A - Cover Sheet – May Revised Version**

*Montana Office of Public Instruction*  
*ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) Program*

---

**MONTANA MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIP (MSP) PROGRAM MINI GRANT  
APPLICATION**

**Applying Institution or Organization:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Program Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Program Director**

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Address:** \_\_\_\_\_

**City:** \_\_\_\_\_ **State:** \_\_\_\_\_ **ZIP Code:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Telephone:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Fax:** \_\_\_\_\_

**E-Mail:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Amount of MSP Funds Requested:** \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**Number of Teachers to be Served Directly:** \_\_\_\_\_

Certification by Authorized or Institutional Official:

The applicant certifies that to the best of his/her knowledge the information in this application is correct, that the filing of this application is duly authorized by the governing body of this organization, or institution, and that the applicant will comply with the attached statement of assurances.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Typed or Printed Name of Authorized  
Official Grants Officer or  
Superintendent of Fiscal Agent**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Title**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature of Authorized Official**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

<b>Appendix B – Statement of Assurances</b>
---

***Montana Office of Public Instruction  
ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Program***

---

**STATEMENT OF ESEA TITLE II, PART B ASSURANCES**

Should an award of funds from the Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) Program be made to the applicant in support of the activities proposed in this application, the authorized signature on the cover page of this application certifies to the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) that the authorized official will:

1. Upon request, provide the Montana OPI with access to records and other sources of information that may be necessary to determine compliance with appropriate federal and state laws and regulations.
2. Conduct educational activities funded by this project in compliance with the following federal laws:
  - a. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964;
  - b. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972;
  - c. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973;
  - d. Age Discrimination Act of 1975;
  - e. Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; and
  - f. Improving America's Schools Act of 1994.
3. Use grant funds to supplement and not supplant funds from nonfederal sources.
4. Take into account during the development of programming the need for greater access to and participation in the targeted disciplines by students from historically underrepresented and underserved groups.
5. Submit, in accordance with stated guidelines and deadlines, all program and evaluation reports required by the U.S. Department of Education and the Montana OPI.
6. The applicant will retain records of the program for five years and will allow access to those records for purposes of review and audit.

Signature Information for Appendix A Cover Page with School Districts as Prime Applicant: The Board of Trustees submitted a Common Assurances form to the Montana OPI for the 2011-12 school year, and no circumstances affecting the validity of the assurances have changed since its submittal. Further, the Board of Trustees has certified that the Common Assurances for Federal Programs are accepted as the basic conditions for local participation and assistance in operation of this Title II Part B MSP.

## Appendix C – Research and Policy Base

### *Montana Office of Public Instruction ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) Program*

---

#### **INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND FOR THE GRANT’S PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT MODEL**

Current research supports the belief that in order to have a positive and lasting impact on classroom instruction and student learning, a high-quality professional development programs must contain the following key elements. A professional development program created through this grant needs to provide for these same elements.

1. The program needs to be classroom focused and enhance the capacity of local teachers to enact curricular reforms that produce higher student achievement in core academic areas.
2. The program needs to recognize that effective and lasting changes in professional beliefs and practices require time, multiple learning opportunities, and appropriate and adequate organizational support.
3. The program needs to both facilitate the growth of a teacher’s subject matter knowledge and increase teacher understanding and use of effective, scientifically research-based instructional strategies.
4. The program needs to provide activities and training that reflect sound research and theory, but are clearly grounded in the practice of teaching and learning.
5. The program needs to employ a variety of professional development styles that both engage the individual teacher’s strengths, but also support and enhance the development of a “learning community” where teachers work in a collaborative and mutually supportive environment.
6. The program needs to be of sufficient duration (a minimum of 30 hrs.) to actively engage the participant and insure lasting impact.
7. The program needs to connect with and build upon, improvement efforts already ongoing in the participant’s school and district.
8. The program needs to allow the participant to utilize curriculum and classroom materials from the participant’s school and district.
9. The program needs to provide for specific and targeted resources to insure there is adequate support for implementation and subsequent sustainability of the professional development.
10. The program needs to emphasize the involvement of school and district administration.
11. The program needs to be data driven.

#### **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

As defined by ARM 10.55.714, “professional development” means instructional related activities that:

1. are focused on teachers as central to student learning, yet include all other members of the school community;
2. are focused on individual, collegial, and organizational improvement;
3. respect and nurture the intellectual and leadership capacity of teachers, principals and others in the school community;
4. reflect proven scientifically based research and practice in teaching, learning and leadership;

### **Appendix C – Research and Policy Base, continued**

5. enable teachers to develop further experience in state content standards and assessment, teaching strategies, use of technologies, and other essential elements in teaching to high standards;
6. promote continuous inquiry and improvement embedded in the daily life of schools;
7. are ongoing and sustained;
8. are planned collaboratively by those who will participate in and facilitate that development;
9. require substantial time and resources;
10. are driven by a coherent long-term plan; and
11. are evaluated ultimately on the basis of their impact on teacher effectiveness and student learning, and this assessment guides subsequent professional development efforts.

### **SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH**

The term “scientifically based research” refers to research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs. It includes research that:

1. employs systematic, empirical methods that draw on observation or experiment and involve rigorous data analyses that are adequate to test the stated hypotheses and justify the general conclusions drawn;
2. relies on measurements or observational methods that provide reliable and valid data across evaluators and observers, across multiple measurements and observations, and across studies by the same or different investigators;
3. is evaluated using experimental or quasi-experimental designs in which individuals, entities, programs, or activities are assigned to different conditions, with appropriate controls to evaluate the effects of the condition of interest and with a preference for random-assignment experiments or other designs to the extent that those designs contain within-condition or across-condition controls;
4. ensures that experimental studies are presented in sufficient detail and clarity to allow for replication or, at minimum, to offer the opportunity to build systematically on their findings; and
5. has been accepted by a peer-reviewed journal or approved by a panel of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective and scientific review.

<b>Appendix D – Partnership Identification Form</b>
---

*Montana Office of Public Instruction  
ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) Program*

---

## **PARTNERSHIP IDENTIFICATION FORM**

*Include a Partnership Identification Form for each of the partner institutions/organizations.*

**PARTNER INSTITUTION:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Contact Name/Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Contact Mailing Address:**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

---

---

**Telephone:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Fax:** \_\_\_\_\_

**E-Mail:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Institution/Organization:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Partner School District Demographics (If Applicable):**



<p align="center"><b>Appendix E – Budget Form</b></p>
---

**Montana Office of Public Instruction**  
**ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) Program**

---

**Budget  
Partnership Funding Request**

**Program Title:**

<b>Direct Cost Requested for Partner</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>1. Salaries &amp; Wages (Professional and Clerical)</b>	
<b>2. Employee Benefits</b>	
<b>3. Travel in State</b>	
<b>4. Travel Out of State</b>	
<b>5. Materials and Supplies</b>	
<b>6. Consultants and Contracts</b>	
<b>7. Teacher Stipends</b>	
<b>8. Equipment (Purchase)</b>	
<b>9. Other (Equipment Rental, Printing, etc.)</b>	
<b>Indirect Costs* (if appropriate)</b>	
<b>Total Budget</b>	
<b>OPI Use Only: Approved By/Date</b>	

**\*The indirect cost rate shall not exceed the indirect cost rate for the partner with the lowest indirect cost rate.**

**This form is a required element of the grant application. Justification for each of the categories shall be included in the budget narrative portion of the application. For reporting, an itemized breakdown of these budget categories and a budget narrative explaining how each line item was calculated and the actual total project cost share must be included.**

## Appendix F – Levels of PD Evaluation

Adapted from Guskey, Thomas R. *Evaluating Professional Development*  
Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc, 2000

EVALUATION LEVEL	QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED	MEASURE	WHAT IS MEASURED?	HOW WILL INFORMATION BE USED?
<b>1 PARTICIPANTS' REACTIONS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did they like it?</li> <li>Was their time well-spent?</li> <li>Did the material make sense?</li> <li>Will it be useful?</li> <li>Was the leader knowledgeable and helpful?</li> <li>Were the refreshments fresh and tasty?</li> <li>Was the room the right temperature?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questionnaires or surveys administered at the end of the session</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initial satisfaction with the experience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To improve professional development program design and delivery</li> </ul>
<b>2 PARTICIPANTS' LEARNING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did participants acquire the intended knowledge and skills?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper-and-pencil instruments</li> <li>Simulations</li> <li>Demonstrations</li> <li>Participant reflections (oral and/or written)</li> <li>Participant portfolios</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New knowledge and skills of participants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To improve instructional practice</li> <li><b>To demonstrate the impact of professional development</b></li> </ul>
<b>3 ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT AND CHANGE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were sufficient resources made available?</li> <li>Were problems addressed quickly and efficiently?</li> <li>Was implementation advocated, facilitated, and supported?</li> <li>Were successes recognized and shared?</li> <li>Was the support public and overt?</li> <li>What was the impact on the organization?</li> <li>Did it affect organizational climate and procedures?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minutes from follow-up meetings</li> <li>Questionnaires</li> <li>Structured interviews with participants and district or school administrators</li> <li>District and school records</li> <li>Participant portfolios</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The organization's advocacy, support, accommodation facilitation, and recognition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To document and improve organizational support</li> <li>To inform future change efforts</li> </ul>
<b>4 PARTICIPANTS' USE OF NEW KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did participants effectively apply the new knowledge and skills?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questionnaires</li> <li>Structured interviews with participants and their supervisors</li> <li>Participant reflections (oral and/or written)</li> <li>Participant portfolios</li> <li>Direct observations</li> <li>Video or audiotapes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degree and quality of implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To document and improve the implementation of program content</li> <li><b>To demonstrate the impact of professional development</b></li> </ul>
<b>5 STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What was the impact on the students?</li> <li>Did it affect student performance or achievement?</li> <li>Did it influence student's physical or emotional well-being?</li> <li>Are students more confident as learners?</li> <li>Is Student Attendance improving?</li> <li>Are dropouts decreasing?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student records</li> <li>School records</li> <li>Questionnaires</li> <li>Structured interviews with students, parents, teachers, and/or administrators</li> <li>Participant portfolios</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student learning outcomes</li> <li>Cognitive (performance and achievement)</li> <li>Affective (attitudes and dispositions)</li> <li>Psychomotor (skills and behaviors)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To focus and improve all aspects of program design, implementation, and follow-up</li> <li><b>To demonstrate the overall impact of professional development</b></li> </ul>

**Montana Office of Public Instruction**
**ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Program Mini Grant**
**OVERALL DESIGN AND EFFICACY OF PROJECT PLAN**

0 – 2 Points	3 - 5 Points
<p><b>Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There is not a complete description of how the project will address all the program goals and grant requirements as outlined in <b>Sections II Goals of Montana MSP Mini Grant Program and VII Requirements and Preparation of Application</b></li> <li>2) There is not a complete description for designing project to align to and coordinate with STREAM</li> <li>3) There is not a complete description of the research base for the project components.</li> <li>4) There is not a complete description of a process to identify and build on previous professional development work in the schools and districts.</li> <li>5) There is not a complete description of how the ongoing goal of increasing educators' understanding of the critical role of college and career readiness standards in the design and delivery of effective instruction and professional development</li> <li>6) All applicable sections of the partnership operational narrative were not addressed</li> <li>7) The likelihood of the overall plan being effective is low</li> </ol>	<p><b>Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There is a complete description of how the project will address all program goals and grant requirements as outlined in <b>Sections II Goals of Montana MSP Mini Grant Program and VII Requirements and Preparation of Application</b></li> <li>2) There is a complete description for designing project to align to and coordinate with STREAM</li> <li>3) There is a complete description of the research base for the project components</li> <li>4) There is a complete description of a process to identify and build on previous professional development work in the schools and districts</li> <li>5) There is a complete description of how the ongoing goal of increasing educators' understanding of the critical role of career and college readiness standards in the design and delivery of effective instruction and professional development</li> <li>6) All applicable sections of the partnership operational narrative were adequately addressed</li> <li>6) The likelihood of the overall plan being effective is moderate to high</li> </ol>

INITIAL SCORE: \_\_\_\_\_

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (5X THE INITIAL SCORE): \_\_\_\_\_

**PARTNERSHIP**

0 – 2 Points	3 - 5 Points
<p><b>Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There is not a complete description of the partnership including:                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. list of all partners</li> <li>b. how the partnership operates and evidence of ongoing collaboration to support the implementation of the partnership to reach its goals</li> <li>c. how the duties and responsibilities are shared between the partners</li> <li>d. how the partnership will foster communication and interaction with STREAM</li> <li>e. How the partnership will foster communication and interaction with all of the partners</li> </ol> </li> <li>2) There is little or no evidence that the partnership has sufficient capacity to organize and manage the project</li> <li>3) There is no evidence that the required core planning team will regularly assemble</li> <li>4) There is not a complete description of how the effectiveness of the partnership will be assessed during the operation time frame</li> </ol>	<p><b>Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There is a complete description of the partnership including:                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. list of all partners</li> <li>b. how the partnership operates and evidence of ongoing collaboration to support the implementation of the partnership to reach its goals</li> <li>c. how the duties and responsibilities are shared between the partners</li> <li>d. how the partnership will foster communication and interaction with STREAM</li> <li>e. how the partnership will foster communication and interaction with all of the partners</li> </ol> </li> <li>2) There is evidence that the partnership has sufficient capacity to organize and manage the project</li> <li>3) There is evidence that the required core planning team will regularly assemble</li> <li>4) There is a complete description of how the effectiveness of the partnership will be assessed both during the development and operation time frame</li> </ol>

--	--

INITIAL SCORE: \_\_\_\_\_

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (3X THE INITIAL SCORE): \_\_\_\_\_

### **IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT AND SUSTAINABILITY FOR PARTICIPANTS**

<b>0 – 2 Points</b>	<b>3 - 5 Points</b>
<p><b>Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, all of the critical attributes listed below:</b></p> <p>1) There is not a complete description of how the project will provide implementation and sustainability support for the school and district participants in alignment and coordination with STREAM, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. how time will be provided for ongoing study, practice, and practice with feedback</li> <li>b. how the project will work with teachers to adapt applicable district mathematics instructional strategies to increase 8<sup>th</sup> grade student learning in mathematics</li> <li>c. how the project will facilitate targeted professional development for teachers who need more intensive or in-depth assistance through the use of regionally based job-embedded professional development delivered through a variety of venues including distance learning</li> <li>d. how the project will ensure the meaningful engagement of school, district, and STREAM leadership</li> <li>e. how the project will provide the teachers and administrators with professional development skills to assist other educators, in their school, district, or region, on the implementation of the common standards for math</li> </ul> <p>2) There is not a description of how continued support for the participants might occur beyond the life of the grant</p>	<p><b>Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:</b></p> <p>1) There is a complete description of how the project will provide implementation and sustainability support for the school and district participants in alignment and coordination with STREAM, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. how time will be provided for ongoing study, practice, and practice with feedback</li> <li>b. how the project will work with teachers to adapt applicable district mathematics instructional strategies to increase 8<sup>th</sup> grade student learning in mathematics</li> <li>c. how the project will facilitate targeted professional development for teachers who need more intensive or in-depth assistance through the use of regionally based job-embedded professional development delivered through a variety of venues including distance learning</li> <li>d. how the project will ensure the meaningful engagement of school, district, and STREAM leadership</li> <li>e. how the project will provide the teachers and administrators with professional development skills to assist other educators, in their school, district, or region, on the implementation of the common standards for math</li> </ul> <p>2) There is a description of how continued support for the participants might occur beyond the life of the grant</p>

INITIAL SCORE: \_\_\_\_\_

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (4X THE INITIAL SCORE): \_\_\_\_\_

### **EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN**

<b>0 – 2 Points</b>	<b>3 - 5 Points</b>
<p><b>Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:</b></p> <p>1) There is not a complete description of how the project will ensure the development of an effective and comprehensive assessment and accountability process (including applicable measurable objectives) by increasing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. active engagement of district administrators and educators</li> <li>b. math common standards content knowledge professional development</li> <li>c. instructional strategies through professional development including implementation assessment</li> <li>d. operation of the project delivery system –regional and school based workshops, distance learning and materials development</li> </ul> <p>2) Applicable levels of the Guskey model were not addressed</p> <p>3) There is not a complete description of what formative evaluation process will be used during implementation to identify barriers and facilitating events or structures that informs the project's ongoing planning and implementation efforts</p> <p>4) There is not a complete description of how the project will communicate and disseminate information on the project and subsequent professional development activities to appropriate and</p>	<p><b>Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:</b></p> <p>1) There is a complete description of how the project will ensure the development of an effective and comprehensive assessment and accountability process (including applicable measurable objectives) by increasing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. active engagement of district administrators and educators</li> <li>b. math common standards content knowledge professional development</li> <li>c. instructional strategies STEM professional development including implementation assessment</li> <li>d. operation of the project delivery system – regional and school based workshops, distance learning and materials development</li> </ul> <p>2) All applicable levels of the Guskey model were addressed, with particular emphasis on Level 5</p> <p>3) There is a complete description of what formative evaluation process will be used during implementation to identify barriers and facilitating events or structures that informs the project's ongoing planning and implementation efforts</p> <p>4) There is a complete description of how the project will communicate and disseminate information on the project and</p>

applicable constituencies	subsequent professional development activities to appropriate and applicable constituencies
---------------------------	---

INITIAL SCORE: \_\_\_\_\_

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (5X THE INITIAL SCORE): \_\_\_\_\_

### **BUDGET AND COST EFFECTIVENESS**

<b>0 – 2 Points</b>	<b>3 - 5 Points</b>
<p><b>Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There is not a complete description outlining the basis for determining the amounts shown on the budget</li> <li>2) The budget is not in alignment with the activities described in the various parts of the grant proposal narrative</li> <li>3) The amount assigned to a given portion of the budget seems either excessive or insufficient given the goals of the project</li> <li>4) All the required budget forms were not included</li> </ol>	<p><b>Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There is a complete description outlining the basis for determining the amounts shown on the budget</li> <li>2) The budget is aligned with the activities described in the various parts of the grant proposal narrative</li> <li>3) The amount assigned to each portion of the budget is sufficient given the goals of the project</li> <li>4) All the required budget forms were included and complete</li> </ol>

INITIAL SCORE: \_\_\_\_\_

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (3X THE INITIAL SCORE): \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Appendix H – Resource Links</b>
------------------------------------

**Montana Office of Public Instruction**

**ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) Program Mini Grant**

---

**RESOURCES**

**LINKS TO COMMON CORE STANDARDS FOR MATHEMATICS**

[http://opi.mt.gov/Curriculum/MontCAS/GetReady.php#gpm1\\_4](http://opi.mt.gov/Curriculum/MontCAS/GetReady.php#gpm1_4)

**MSP HOME PAGE:** <http://www.opi.mt.gov/curriculum/msp/>

**LINK TO ED STEM WEB PAGE:** [ESEA STEM Blueprint](#)